

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FI	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
09/688,501	01 10/16/2000		Shridhar P. Joshi	47079-00077	3225	
30223	7590	01/25/2006		EXAMINER		
JENKENS & GILCHRIST, P.C.				RADA, ALEX P		
225 WEST WASHINGTON SUITE 2600				ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
CHICAGO, IL 60606				3713		

DATE MAILED: 01/25/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
09/688,501	JOSHI, SHRIDHAR P.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Alex P. Rada	3713		

Advisory Action	09/688,501	JOSHI, SHRIDHAR	HRIDHAR P.	
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Alex P. Rada	3713		
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence addi	ress	
THE REPLY FILED 03 January 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.		
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or o this application, applicant must timely file one of the folloplaces the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No. (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in comp following time periods:	owing replies: (1) an amendment, a otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in liance with 37 CFR 1.114. The repl	ffidavit, or other evide compliance with 37 C	ence, which CFR 41.31; or	
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing of this Adverse the period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adverse, the period for reply expire later the event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b) MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(fextensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on	isory Action, or (2) the date set forth in th an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o . ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FI ).	f the final rejection. RST REPLY WAS FILED	OWT NIHTIW C	
been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension a CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened stabove, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three month parent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL	and the corresponding amount of the fee. atutory period for reply originally set in the	The appropriate extension final Office action; or (2)	n fee under 37 as set forth in (b)	
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in com of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any e Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must I AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)	), to avoid dismissal o	of the appeal.	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, <ul> <li>(a) They raise new issues that would require further co</li> <li>(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo</li> <li>(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or</li> <li>(d) They present additional claims without canceling a</li> </ul>	onsideration and/or search (see NO ow); tter form for appeal by materially re	TE below); educing or simplifying		
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)) 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.		ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).	
<ul><li>5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s</li><li>6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a</li></ul>		, timely filed amendm	ent canceling	
the non-allowable claim(s).  7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proposed. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  Claim(s) allowed:  Claim(s) objected to:		vill be entered and an	explanation of	
Claim(s) rejected: 37-62. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:				
<ul> <li>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</li> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ul>	nd sufficient reasons why the affida	vit or other evidence i	is necessary	
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary.	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe ry and was not earlier presented. S	eal and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(	ils to provide a 1).	
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the control of the contr	on of the status of the claims after	entry is below or attac	:hed.	
11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered by See Continuation Sheet.	ut does NOT place the application	in condition for allowa	ince because:	
12: Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).  13. Other:		XUAN M. THAI SORY PATENT EXA	MINER	
		- 1 - 11V		

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant conteds that the claimed invention is directed toward a remote gaming method and a computer therfore, where players at gaming terminal located outside a gaming establishment may play gaming machines located inside the gaming establishment.

The definition of the word "remote" is separated by an interval or space greater than usual. Wiltshire discloses communication pathways that are remote having any type of local area, wide area, or global communication pathways, including the Internet and th World Wide Web (col. 5, lines 31-33). Thus Wiltshire is capable of a remote gaming method and a computer, where players at gaming terminals located outside (remote) a gaming establishment playing gaming mahcines located inside the gaming establishment. Applicant contends that the examiner has failed to meet the standard for raising a functinally equivalent rejection.

The examiner notes that the statement used in the office action on page 9, lines 5-8 was to make a point that physical gaming machines were re-introcudes as video based gaming machine, which is very commin and very well known in industry today. As noted in the Final office action, when a gaming machine calculates the game results on the gaming machine at a gaming site, the functional equivalent to that would be a gaming machine running a program and the calculations are carried out on a sever located at a gaming a site and routed back to the gaming machine at the gaming site. The only difference is the gaming results are calculated on the server and communicated back to the gaming machine instead of calculating the gaming results at the gaming machine itself. If you take the same computer based video gaming machine and place that video game program on a home PC, the only things that have changed are how the program (results and calculations) are being communicated and how wagers are accepted and payouts awarded. Therefore, a host/server computer executing a casino game program is functionally equivalent to a gaming machine in a gaming establishment.